

REMARKS

The Office Action dated May 11, 2009 has been fully considered by the Applicant.

Attached is a Petition for Three Month Extension of Time. Also enclosed is a check to the cover the government fees.

Claim 16 has been currently amended. Support for the amendments can be found in Applicant's specification on Pages 3-5, 10 and 11 and in Figure 4, as well as throughout the specification. Claims 5, and 7-8, 16-18 and 20 have been previously presented. Claims 1-4, 6, 9-15 and 19 have been canceled.

Claims 5 and 16-17 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 5,845,084 to Cordell et al and further in view of United States Patent No. 6,643,641 to Snyder. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 16 has been currently amended to clarify the step that following selection of the web page in response to a user instruction, a first portion of data is received and processed to generate and display the web page in an initial display format.

In addition claim 16 has been further amended to clarify the step that following selection of the web page and as the data is being received by a browser, preventing the browser from reformatting the display of the selected web page until a predetermined amount of data is received by the browser since the initial format or previous reformats of that web page, the predetermined amount being specified prior to obtaining data for that web page, and displaying the reformatted web page.

Applicant agrees with Examiner Stork on Page 4 of the Office Action that Cordell '084 fails to disclose that the browser is prevented from reformatting the display of the web page until a

predetermined amount of data is received by the browser since the previous reformat of that web page, said predetermined amount being specified prior to obtaining data for that web page.

However, Applicant does not agree with the Examiner's comments with respect to Snyder (US6643641). Snyder discloses a system for generating web page snapshots which can be associated with search engine results. Thus, when a user searches for a particular term using the search engine, the results are displayed with snapshots alongside the same to provide the user with a better indication of the contents of each result. In particular, Snyder states at Col. 10, lines 32-38 that "the user's browser displays the search results in conventional form, namely by showing a hyperlink to the address, and optionally a description or excerpt, and displays a snapshot of how the identified page is likely to appear if or when loaded ..." (emphasis added).

However, Snyder adds no further teaching to Cordell with respect to the claim limitation of preventing the browser from reformatting the web page as the data is being received by the browser, until a predetermined amount of data is received by the browser since the initial format or previous reformat of that web page.

While Snyder discloses that the crawler generates snapshots for linked websites, this is not a predetermined amount of data with respect to that being received by the browser since the initial format or previous reformat of a particular web page. Indeed, on receiving the results from the search engine, the display would be reformatted after each image had been loaded, and thus the amount of data received prior to such reformatting is post-determined.

Thus according to Snyder, and indeed Cordell, the user has no control over the way in which a web page is reformatted as data is downloaded by the browser. This results in a jerky display as a processor attempts to reformat the display after the data for each image in the web page is received.

The invention solves this problem by preventing the web page from being reformatted automatically while data is being downloaded, such that the web page is displayed and reformatted in user-defined portions, subject to the amount of data specified by the user.

Claim 16 has been amended accordingly, and Applicant believes that it is clear that it is novel and inventive over the aforementioned prior art. Applicant sincerely believes that currently amended claim 16 is not taught or suggested in the cited references and therefore respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection.

With respect to claim 17, there is no teaching in Snyder with respect to reformatting a page as data is downloaded by the browser. Snyder may re-purpose stored snapshot images, but there is no control over how the resulting page is drawn as it is simply formatted and reformatted automatically as each image is received. In contrast the present invention teaches drawing a first section of the web page (initial format), then re-drawing the page (reformatting) after a predetermined amount of data is received.

Applicant would like to additionally point out that the cited prior art does not reduce the number of reformats required in displaying the web page as data is received, as claimed, which further distinguishes Applicant's invention.

With respect to claims 18 and 20, Applicant still has been unable to identify the feature of determining and noting a highest y-coordinate point or level in the displayed portion of the web page and commencing a timer to prevent reformatting, as the reference cited by the Examiner does not appear to be directed to the same. The Examiner has failed to answer Applicant's previously-submitted query for further information on this point, and if such a feature cannot be found in the prior art, the objection should be retracted.

The cited references taken alone or in combination do not teach or suggest Applicant's currently amended claim independent claim 18. Applicant sincerely request reconsideration of the rejection.

Claims 7 and 8 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cordell, and further in view of United States Patent No. 5894554 to Lowery et al.

Claim 7 depends on dependent claim 5 which further depends upon independent claim 17. Applicant believes that dependent claims 7 and 5 are patentable over the cited references for the same reasons as stated above. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection.

Claim 8 depends upon dependent claim 7 which further depends upon claim 5 which depends upon independent claim 17. Applicant believes that dependent claims 8, 7 and 5 are patentable over the cited references for the same reasons as stated above. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection.

It is believed that the claims herein define the invention over the cited references and that the forgoing is fully responsive to the outstanding Office Action. If, for any reason, the claims are not in condition for allowance, it is because of a mistake or a misunderstanding of the Office Action and in such case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (918) 587 2000 so that any remaining amendments to place the application in condition for allowance can hopefully be achieved in a telephone interview.

If any further charges or refunds are associated with this application, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 08-1500.

HEAD, JOHNSON & KACHIGIAN

Respectfully submitted,

Dated:

9 November 2009

By:



Mark G. Kachigian, Reg. No. 32,840

Head, Johnson & Kachigian

228 West 17th Place

Tulsa, Oklahoma 74119

(918) 587-2000